# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/576,223 | 04/14/2006 | Bart Van Coppenolle | DECLE58.003APC | 7369 |

20995    7590    10/10/2007
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| SUAREZ, FELIX E |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2857 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 10/10/2007 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 10/576,223 | VAN COPPENOLLE ET AL. |
| **Office Action Summary** | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Felix E. Suarez | 2857 | |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 July 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 May 2006</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1.      Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12,14-22 and 28-33 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,291,393).

With respect to claims 1, 19 and 28, Matsumoto et al. (hereafter

Matsumoto) teaches a method (or a computer readable medium or a device) of

evaluating a physical object, the method comprising:

reading instructions of a macro (see col. 7, lines 44-46),

said macro configured for use with measurement equipment, said

measurement equipment being capable of performing measurements of a

physical object (see col. 8, lines 5-17),

said macro comprising instructions for said equipment to perform

an evaluation of a physical object (see col. 8, lines 35-45);

performing the instructions of said macro upon a numerical representation of the surface of said object so as to generate macro results (see col. 7, lines 22-32 and col. 8, lines 5-17); and

obtaining from the macro results, an evaluation of the physical object (see col. 8, lines 35-45 and FIGS. 9, 12), when the evaluation is output (see col. 12 line 30 to col. 14 line 50, TABLE 1, 2 3, 4).

With respect to claims 2 and 29, Matsumoto further teaches, said numerical representation of the surface is obtained by scanning part or all of the physical object using an object scanner (see col. 7, lines 22-32).

With respect to claim 3, Matsumoto further teaches, said numerical representation of the surface is any of point cloud data, triangulated mesh data, rendered surface data, and polyline data (see col. 6, lines 34-40; col. 11, lines 34-41 and FIG. 11).

With respect to claims 4 and 30, Matsumoto further teaches, said measurement equipment is a Coordinate Measuring Machine, CMM (see col. 10, lines 43-58).

With respect to claim 6, Matsumoto further teaches, said macro comprises CMM commands (see col. 9, lines 36-50).

With respect to claim 8, Matsumoto further teaches, comprising communicating the said evaluation in the format of CMM measurement results (see col. 9, lines 36-50 and TABLE 2, 4).

With respect to claim 9, Matsumoto further teaches that, the instructions of said macro that are performed relate to the measurement of data from the numerical representation of the surface (see col. 10, lines 43-58).

With respect to claim 10, Matsumoto further teaches, comprising performing translations through the surface of the object (see col. 10, lines 43-48).

With respect to claim 11, Matsumoto further teaches that, the macro comprises instructions for performing a measurement comprising:

(a) determining elements of data that numerically represent the object, and that correspond to the position on the physical object to be measured, without increasing the resolution by calculating the co-ordinates of any additional points (see col. 10, lines 8-17);

(b) calculating additional points by interpolation of the determined elements, wherein the additional points increase the resolution in an area of a position to be measured (see col. 11, lines 34-41 and FIG. 11);

(c) calculating from the area of increased resolution a measurement of the

object (see col. 11, lines 42-62).


With respect to claim 12, Matsumoto further teaches that, one or more

instructions of said macro have been created by using said numerical

representation of the physical object (see col. 10, lines 8-17).


With respect to claim 14, Matsumoto further teaches, said instructions are

part of a measurement sequence generated by recording commands of a

Coordinate Measuring Machine measurement program (see col. 10, lines 8-17).


With respect to claim 15, Matsumoto further teaches, said instructions are

part of a measurement sequence in a Coordinate Measuring Machine

measurement program (see col. 10, lines 19-42).


With respect to claim 16, Matsumoto further teaches, said evaluation

comprises the execution of steps on a computer in an automatic way without

interaction with the user of said computer during the execution of said steps (see

col. 10, lines –42).


With respect to claim 17, Matsumoto teaches, a method of virtually

measuring an object comprising: performing an evaluation of a cloud of points

virtually representing said object and calculating the value or values that

approximate the value or values that would result from the measurement of said

object by a measuring device (see col. 11, lines 34-41), wherein the evaluation is

output (see col. 12 line 30 to col. 14 line 50, TABLE 1, 2 3, 4).

With respect to claim 18, Matsumoto teaches, a method of virtually

probing an object, the method comprising: performing and evaluation of a cloud

of points virtually representing said object; and calculating or selecting a point

that approximates a point that would result from the probing of a CMM on the

said object, (see col. 11, lines 42-53), wherein the evaluation is output (see col.

12 line 30 to col. 14 line 50, TABLE 1, 2 3, 4).

With respect to claim 20, Matsumoto further teaches, comprising

instructions which, when executed cause the computer to receive a numerical

representation of the physical object from a remote computer (see col. 1 line 63

to col. 12 line 20).

With respect to claim 21, Matsumoto further teaches that, the numerical

representation is received from the remote computer by physical transport of a

computer readable storage medium holding said numerical representation (see

col. 11 line 63 to col. 12 line 20).

With respect to claim 22, Matsumoto further teaches, said computer

readable storage medium comprises magnetic disk, magnetic tape (see col. 7,

lines 33-44).

With respect to claims 31-33, Matsumoto further teaches, that the output

of the evaluation is a report (see col. 12 line 30 to col. 14 line 50, TABLE 1, 2 3,

4).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the
basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.      Claims 5, 7 and 13, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,291,393) in view of

Michiwaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,022).

With respect to claims 5, 7 and 13, Katsumoto teaches all the features

of the claimed invention, except that Katsumoto does not teach;

wherein said macro comprises Dimensional Measuring Interface

Standard, DMIS, commands; nor

comprising communicating said evaluation by part of a DMIS-

measurement program or by using DMIS commands format.

But Michiwaki teaches in a measuring AID system that, the Dimensional

Measuring Interface Standard (DMIS) language is a language specification that

has been developed for exchanging data between a Computer Aided Design

(CAD) and a three-dimensional measuring apparatus. The CAD system sends

definition information of geographic shapes created as designed values and

information of a measurement path to the three-dimensional measuring

apparatus. The three dimensional measuring apparatus overwrites the measured

results to a part program file in the DMIS language and sends back the resultant

file to the CAD system (see Michiwaki; col. 5, lines 34-50).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Matsumoto to include a DMIS language

as taught by Michiwaki, because the DMIS language of Michiwaki allows to

exchange data between a Computer Aided Design (CAD) and a three-

dimensional measuring apparatus, as desired.


3.      Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,291,393) in view of

Kreidler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,954,680).


With respect to claim 23, Matsumoto et al. (hereafter Matsumoto) further

teaches providing instructions, which, when executed cause the computer to

display a user interface (see col. 7, lines 54-59).

Matsumoto does not teach displaying a user interface on a web browser of

a remote computer connected to the Internet.

But Kreidler et al. (hereafter Kreidler) teaches in a system for the electronic provision of services for machines via a data communication link, that, in the area of industrial automation technology and, in particular, in the field of numerically controlled processing machines, on the basis of an Internet connection, automatic services or data contents or software components required for this purpose are made available to a plurality of end-customers having machines with witch information is exchanged bi-directionally (see Kreidler; col. 7, lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Matsumoto to include services for machines via data communication link as taught by Kreidler, because the services for machines via data communication are made to a plurality of end-customers having machines with witch information is exchanged bi-directionally through Internet, as desired.

Matsumoto further teaches, said interface allowing a user to send the numerical representation of the physical object over the Internet to a computer configured to perform said method (see Matsumoto; col. 7, lines 54-59).


With respect to claims 24-26, Matsumoto further teaches providing instructions, which, when executed, cause the computer to display a user interface (see col. 7, lines 54-59).

Matsumoto does not teach, displaying a user interface on a web browser of a remote computer connected to the Internet, said interface allowing a user to send said macro (or the title of said macro) over the Internet to a computer configured to perform said method.

But Kreidler teaches in a system for the electronic provision of services for machines via a data communication link, that, in the area of industrial automation technology and, in particular, in the field of numerically controlled processing machines, on the basis of an Internet connection, automatic services or data contents or software components required for this purpose are made available to a plurality of end-customers having machines with witch information is exchanged bi-directionally (see Kreidler; col. 7, lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Matsumoto to include services for machines via data communication link as taught by Kreidler, because the services for machines via data communication link allows to a plurality of end-customers having machines with information, exchange this information bi-directionally through Internet, as desired.


4.      Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,291,393) in view of Rabin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,948).

With respect to claim 27, Katsumoto teaches all the features of the claimed invention, except that Katsumoto does not teach, providing instructions, which, when executed, cause the computer to display a pay-per-use interface on a web browser of a remote computer connected to the Internet, said pay-per-use interface configured to perform one or more of the following:

(a) requesting a username and password to the remote computer user so as to enable a user to access an account for using the method;

(b) requesting billing information of the remote computer user;

(c) indicating a billing amount to the remote computer user, the billing amount relating to the number of evaluations performed; and

(d) providing a username and password to the remote computer user so as to enable a user to access an account for using the method.

But Rabin et al. (hereafter Rabin) teaches in an apparatus for protecting information that, as an example of pay-per-use or pay-per-view, each time an instance of pay-per-use software is used, the supervising program (SP) can record this in the RUN COUNT field. The RUN COUNT information can later be used for billing purposes (see Rabin; col. 43, lines 37-43).

Rabin also teaches that, an example of the user identification ID (USER) may be a username and/or password combination. An example of the identification of the user device ID (DEVICE) may include the hostname, host id, IP address, serial number or other hardware or device specific information that

can uniquely distinguish this user device from other user devices (see Rabin; col. 44, lines 1-7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Matsumoto to include the supervising program as taught by Rabin, because the supervising program allows to execute a pay-per-use instructions requesting username and/or password combination for a billing purpose, as desired.

### *Response to Arguments*

5.      Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See MPEP ¶ 7.37.

Applicants' primary argument for independent claim 1 (and same reasons for independent claims 17 and 18) is that,

"*Matsumoto et al. [U.S. Patent No. 5,291,393] (hereafter Matsumoto), however, does not teach all of the features of Claim 1, as amended. For example, Matsumoto does not teach a method including evaluating a physical object and outputting an evaluation of the object. Matsumoto teaches generation of a work program which includes manufacturing instructions for the machine, but does not teach outputting an evaluation of the object. The evaluation of the object is particularly advantageous at least for the reason that the evaluation, for example, can give information about an object without need for observation of*

*the object itself. In contrast, the work program of Matsumoto gives instructions on*

*how to create an as yet non-existing product.*

Matsumoto teaches that, FIG. 6a is a schematic diagram of the

Computerized Numerical Control (CNC) machine tool apparatus having the NC

machine 24 and a control unit 25. The NC machine 24 includes a main spindle

24S to which the touch sensor 26 is attached, and a table 24T on which a work-

piece 40 is held. The spindle 24S is driven by a drive mechanism to move in a

three-dimensional space with respect to the table 24T (see Matsumoto; col. 7,

lines 22-32 and FIG. 6a).

The Examiner considers that the apparatus of Matsumoto is capable to

touch by the touch sensor a physical work-piece held in a table, and convert this

touch signals in a three-dimensional representation by the CNC.

With respect to the evaluation of the physical object, the Matsumoto CNC

after to take the measurement of an object is capable to write down a sort of

tables (see Matsumoto; col. 12 line 30 to col. 14 line 50, TABLE 1, 2, 3, 4) which

the user can be use to evaluate a work-piece such as the drilled pipe shown in

FIGS. 9 and 12 of Matsumoto.

The Examiner considers that Matsumoto, meet the limitations claimed by

the applicant.

### Conclusion

### Prior Art

6.      The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sawaga et al. [U.S. Patent No. 6,804,575] describes an automatic

programming apparatus that executes a numerical controller process.

Sutula, JR. [U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114537]

describes a model surface by numerical control.

Yamazaki et al. [U.S. Patent No. 6,400,998] describes a numerical control

machine tool system.

7.      Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

communications from the examiner should be directed to Felix Suarez, whose

telephone number is (571) 272-2223. The examiner can normally be reached on

weekdays from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano can be reached on (571) 272-7925. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final

communications.

September 28, 2007

F.S.

ELISEO RAMOS-FELICIANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER